

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/857,012	CARO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paul B. Prebilic	3738	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Paul B. Prebilic.

(3) Alexander Piesold, UK atty.

(2) Paul Gilson, Assn. Rep.

(4) Jay Moldovanyi, US atty Reg# 29,678.

Date of Interview: 05 June 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: One sample of each a helical stent and a straight stent (control) were provided as evidence.

Claim(s) discussed: all claims in general.

Identification of prior art discussed: Caro and Simon as applied in the most recent Office action.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



Paul B. Prebilic
Primary Examiner

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Gilson explained how the present invention is designed with openings in the sidewall and to impose a shape on the natural blood vessel in order to provide swirl flow. He showed slides of photographs and test data that indicated that the restenosis area with a straight tubular stent was about twice that obtained by the use of a helical tubular stent. Mr. Gilson also explained that the Caro prior art was to a helical tubular graft with closed walls that was designed to be placed mostly outside a blood vessel and where the sidewall thereof has no openings. The stent of Caro prior art he argued, was a straight tubular stent that was designed to prevent kinking in certain areas thereof. Mr. Gilson, Piesold, and Moldovanyi all asserted that the stent of the Caro prior art would ideally conform to the helical tubular shape, yet prevent kinking. The Examiner thought that these were sound arguments, and that he will have to evaluate them against the language of Caro prior art and the other prior art of record once the response is filed.